10

13

22

- Adaptogen Science Tasty Whey 100% Premium Whey Protein Chocolate Peanut Butter (lead)
- Adaptogen Science Tasty ISO Hydrolyzed 100% Whey Protein Isolate Chocolate Truffle (lead and cadmium)
- Adaptogen Science Tasty ISO Hydrolyzed 100% Whey Protein Isolate Vanilla Sundae (lead)
- Adaptogen Science Tasty Whey 100% Premium Whey Protein Cookie Butter (lead)
- Adaptogen Science Tasty Whey 100% Premium Whey Protein Cookies & Cream (lead)
- Adaptogen Science Tasty Whey Deluxe Instantized 100% Pure Whey Protein French Vanilla Swirl (lead)
- Adaptogen Science Tasty Whey Deluxe Instantized 100% Pure Whey Protein Chocolate Meltdown (lead)
- Lead and cadmium (hereinafter, the "LISTED CHEMICALS") are substances known to the State¹ of California to cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.
- 3. The ingestion of the PRODUCTS causes exposure to the LISTED CHEMICALS at levels requiring a "clear and reasonable warning" under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code ("H&S Code") section 25249.5, et seq. (also known as "Proposition 65"). DEFENDANT has failed to provide the health hazard warnings required by Proposition 65.
- 4. DEFENDANT's past and continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing, and/or sales of the PRODUCTS without the required health hazard warnings, causes or threatens to cause individuals to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to levels of the LISTED CHEMICALS that violate or threaten to violate Proposition 65.
- 5. PLAINTIFF seeks injunctive relief enjoining DEFENDANT from the continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing, and/or sales of the PRODUCTS in California without provision of clear and reasonable warnings regarding the risks of cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm posed by exposure to the LISTED CHEMICALS through the ingestion of the PRODUCTS. PLAINTIFF seeks an injunctive order compelling DEFENDANT to bring its business practices into compliance with Proposition 65 by providing

All statutory and regulatory references herein are to California law, unless otherwise specified.

a clear and reasonable warning to each individual who has been and who in the future may be exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS from the ingestion of the PRODUCTS. PLAINTIFF also seeks an order compelling DEFENDANT to identify and locate each individual person who in the past has purchased the PRODUCTS, and to provide to each such purchaser a clear and reasonable warning that ingestion of the PRODUCTS will cause exposures to the LISTED CHEMICALS.

6. In addition to injunctive relief, PLAINTIFF seeks an assessment of civil penalties up to the maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per exposure authorized by Proposition 65 to remedy DEFENDANT's failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings regarding exposures to the LISTED CHEMICALS.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.
- 8. This Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANT because, based on information and belief, DEFENDANT is a business having sufficient minimum contacts with California, or otherwise intentionally availing itself of the California market through the manufacture, distribution and sale of the PRODUCTS in the State of California, to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- Venue in this action is proper in the Alameda Superior Court because the
 DEFENDANT has violated or threatens to violate California law in the County of Alameda.
- 10. On June 15, 2018, PLAINTIFF sent a 60-Day Notice of Proposition 65 Violation to the requisite public enforcement agencies and to ADAPTOGEN. The Notice was issued pursuant to, and in compliance with, the requirements of H&S Code section 25249.7(d) and the statute's implementing regulations regarding the notice of the violations to be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to the violators. The Notice included, inter alia, the following

23

information: the name, address, and telephone number of the noticing individuals; the name of the alleged violator; the statute violated; the approximate time period during which violations occurred; and descriptions of the violations, including the chemicals involved, the route of toxic exposure, and the specific product or type of product causing the violations, and was issued as follows:

- a. DEFENDANT was provided a copy of the Notice by Certified Mail.
- b. DEFENDANT was provided a copy of a document entitled "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary," which is also known as Appendix A to Title 27 of CCR §25903.
- The California Attorney General was provided a copy of the Notice via online submission.
- d. The California Attorney General was provided with a Certificate of Merit by the attorney for the noticing parties, stating that there is a reasonable and meritorious case for this action, and attaching factual information sufficient to establish a basis for the certificate, including the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(h)(2).
- e. The district attorneys, city attorneys or prosecutors of each jurisdiction within which the PRODUCTS are offered for sale within California were provided with a copy of the Notice pursuant to H&S Code § 25249.7(d)(1).
- 11. At least 60 days have elapsed since PLAINTIFF sent the Notice to DEFENDANT. The appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action under H&S Code section 25249.5, et seq. against DEFENDANT based on the allegations herein.

PARTIES

12. PLAINTIFF is a non-profit corporation organized under California's Corporation Law. ERC is dedicated to, among other causes, reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic substances, consumer protection, worker safety, and corporate responsibility.

- ERC is a person within the meaning of H&S Code section 25118 and brings this
 enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to H&S Code section 25249.7(d).
- DEFENDANT ADAPTOGEN SCIENCE, LLC is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Florida, and is a person doing business within the meaning of H&S Code section 25249.11.
- 15. DEFENDANT has manufactured, packaged, distributed, marketed, and /or sold the PRODUCTS for sale and/or use in California and the County of Alameda. ERC is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that DEFENDANT continues to manufacture, package, distribute, market and/or sell the PRODUCTS for sale and/or use in California and in Alameda County. DEFENDANT knows and intends that the PRODUCTS are distributed, marketed and sold to consumers in California.

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 16. The People of the State of California have declared in Proposition 65 their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm." (Section 1(b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition 65).
- 17. To effect this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" before being exposed to substances listed by the State of California as causing cancer or reproductive toxicity. H&S Code section 25249.6 states, in pertinent part:

No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual....

- 18. "Knowingly' refers only to knowledge of the fact that a discharge of, release of, or exposure to a chemical listed pursuant to Section 25249.8(a) of the Act is occurring. No knowledge that the discharge, release or exposure is unlawful is required." (27 California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 25102(n).)
- 19. Proposition 65 provides that any "person who violates or threatens to violate" the statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code §25249.7). The phrase

"threaten to violate" is defined to mean creating "a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a violation will occur" (H&S Code §25249.11(e)). Violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation of the Act. (H&S Code §25249.7.)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 20. On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed the chemical lead as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity. Lead became subject to the warning requirement one year later and was therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on February 27, 1988. (27 CCR § 25000, et seq.; H&S Code §25249.5, et seq.). Due to the high toxicity of lead, the maximum allowable dose level (MADL) for lead is 0.5 μg/day (micrograms a day) for reproductive toxicity. (27 CCR § 25805(b).)
- 21. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed the chemicals lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer. Lead and lead compounds became subject to the warning requirement one year later and were therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on October 1, 1993 (27 CCR § 25000, et seq.; H&S Code §25249.6 et seq.). Due to the carcinogenicity of lead, the no significant risk level for lead is 15 μg/day (micrograms a day). (27 CCR § 25705(b)(1).)
- 22. On May 1, 1997, the State of California listed the chemical cadmium as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity. (State of California EPA OEHHA Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 Chemicals Known to the State to Cause Cancer and Reproductive Toxicity.) The MADL for cadmium as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity is 4.1 micrograms per day. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 27, § 25805, subd. (b).)
- 23. On October 1, 1987, the State of California listed the chemicals cadmium and cadmium compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer. (State of California EPA OEHHA Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 Chemicals Known to the State to Cause Cancer and Reproductive Toxicity.)
- To test DEFENDANT's PRODUCTS for lead and/or cadmium, PLAINTIFF
 hired a well-respected and accredited testing laboratory. The results of testing undertaken by

PLAINTIFF of DEFENDANT's PRODUCTS show that the PRODUCTS tested were in violation of the 0.5 μg/day (lead) and/or 4.1 μg/day (cadmium) "safe harbor" daily dose limits set forth in Proposition 65's regulations. Ingestion of lead and/or cadmium produces much higher exposure levels and health risks than dermal exposure to these chemicals.

- 25. At all times relevant to this action, DEFENDANT, therefore, has knowingly and intentionally exposed the consumers of the PRODUCTS to the LISTED CHEMICALS without first giving a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.
- 26. The PRODUCTS have allegedly been sold by DEFENDANT for use in California since at least June 15, 2015. The PRODUCTS continue to be distributed and sold in California without the requisite warning information.
- 27. On June 15, 2018, ERC served DEFENDANT and each of the appropriate public enforcement agencies with a Proposition 65 Notice, a document entitled "Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5" that provided DEFENDANT and the public enforcement agencies with notice that DEFENDANT was in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn purchasers and individuals using the PRODUCTS that the ingestion of the PRODUCTS exposes them to lead and/or cadmium, chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity (a true and correct copy of the 60-Day Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference).
- 28. As a proximate result of acts by DEFENDANT, as a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code section 25249.11, individuals throughout the State of California, including in the County of Alameda, have been exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS without a clear and reasonable warning. The individuals subject to the illegal exposures include normal and foreseeable consumers of the PRODUCTS, as well as all other persons exposed to the PRODUCTS.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Injunctive Relief for Violations of Health and Safety Code §25249.5, et seq. concerning the PRODUCTS described in the June 15, 2018, Prop. 65 Notice)

Against DEFENDANT

PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 28,

inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.

- 30. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANT, at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, has violated or threatens to violate H&S Code section 25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who ingest the PRODUCTS set forth in the Notice to the LISTED CHEMICALS, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals pursuant to H&S Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11(f).
- 31. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANT has violated or threatens to violate H&S Code section 25249.6 and is therefore subject to an injunction ordering DEFENDANT to stop violating Proposition 65, to provide warnings to all present and future customers, and to provide warnings to DEFENDANT's past customers who purchased or ingested the PRODUCTS without receiving a clear and reasonable warning.
- An action for injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(a).
- 33. Continuing commission by DEFENDANT of the acts alleged above will irreparably harm the citizens of the State of California, for which harm they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANT, as set forth hereafter.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Civil Penalties for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. concerning the PRODUCTS described in PLAINTIFF's Notice)

Against DEFENDANT

- 34. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 33, inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.
- 35. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANT at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, has violated H&S Code section 25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who ingest the PRODUCTS set forth in the Notice to the LISTED CHEMICALS, without first

providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals pursuant to H&S Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11(f).

36. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANT is liable, pursuant to H&S Code section 25249.7(b), for a civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per violation for each unlawful exposure to the LISTED CHEMICALS from the PRODUCTS.

Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANT, as set forth hereafter.

THE NEED FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by this reference Paragraphs 1 through
 as if set forth below.
- 38. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANT has caused or threatens to cause irreparable harm for which there is no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law. In the absence of equitable relief, DEFENDANT will continue to create a substantial risk of irreparable injury by continuing to cause or threatening to cause consumers to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS through the ingestion of the PRODUCTS.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, PLAINTIFF accordingly prays for the following relief:

- A. a preliminary and permanent injunction, pursuant to H&S Code section 25249.7(b), enjoining DEFENDANT, its agents, employees, assigns, and all persons acting in concert or participating with DEFENDANT, from distributing or selling the PRODUCTS in California without first providing a clear and reasonable warning, within the meaning of Proposition 65, that the consumers of the PRODUCTS are exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS;
- B. an injunctive order, pursuant to H&S Code section 25249.7(b), compelling DEFENDANT to identify and locate each individual who has purchased the PRODUCTS since June 15, 2015, and to provide a warning to such person that ingestion of the PRODUCTS will expose the consumer to chemicals known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm;

- C. an assessment of civil penalties pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(b), against DEFENDANT in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65;
- D. an award to PLAINTIFF of its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, as PLAINTIFF shall specify in further application to the Court; and,
 - E. such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

DATED: August 27, 2018

LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO

Richard M. Franco Attorney for Plaintiff

Environmental Research Center, Inc.

EXHIBIT A

LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO

6500 ESTATES DRIVE OAKLAND, CA 94611 510.684.1022 RICK@RFRANCOLAW.COM

VIA CERTIFIED/FIRST CLASS MAIL

Current President or CEO Adaptogen Science, LLC 3250 NE 1st Avenue, Suite 24 Miami, FL 33137

Current President or CEO Adaptogen Science, LLC 1342 NW 78th Avenue Miami, FL 33126

VIA PERSONAL SERVICE/CERTIFIED and FIRST CLASS MAIL

Fernando Rosenberg (Registered Agent for Adaptogen Science, LLC) 3250 NE 1st Avenue, Suite 24 Miami, FL 33137

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553 sgrassini@contracostada.org

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator Lassen County 220 S. Lassen Street Susanville, CA 96130 mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney Monterey County 1200 Aguajito Road Monterey, CA 93940 Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Allison Haley, District Attorney Napa County 1127 First Street, Suite C Napa, CA 94559 CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney Riverside County 3072 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501 Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney Sacramento County 901 G Street Sacramento, CA 95814 Prop65@sacda.org

Kathryn L. Turner, Chief Deputy City Attorney San Diego City Attorney 1200 Third Avenue San Diego, CA 92101 CityAttyCrimProp65@sandiego.gov

Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney San Francisco County 732 Brannan Street San Francisco, CA 94103 gregory.alker@sfgov.org

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney San Joaquin County 222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202 Stockton, CA 95202 DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney San Luis Obispo County County Government Center Annex, 4th Floor San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney Santa Barbara County 1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101 DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney Santa Clara County 70 W Hedding St San Jose, CA 95110 EPU@da.sccgov.org

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street Santa Cruz, CA 95060 Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney Sonoma County 600 Administration Dr Sonoma, CA 95403 jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney Tulare County 221 S Mooney Blvd Visalia, CA 95370 Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney Ventura County 800 S Victoria Ave Ventura, CA 93009 daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney Yolo County 301 Second Street Woodland, CA 95695 cfepd@yolocounty.org

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Office of the California Attorney General

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

District Attorneys of Select California Counties and Select City Attorneys (See Attached Certificate of Service)

Re: Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq.

Dear Addressees:

I represent the Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC") in connection with this Notice of Violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, which is codified at California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq. and also referred to as Proposition 65.

ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of

hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

The name of the Company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the "Violator") is:

Adaptogen Science, LLC

The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemicals in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- 1. Adaptogen Science Tasty Whey 100% Premium Whey Protein Sea Salt Caramel Lead
- 2. Adaptogen Science Tasty Whey 100% Premium Whey Protein Vanilla Creme -Lead
- 3. Adaptogen Science Tasty Whey 100% Premium Whey Protein Chocolate Peanut Butter Lead
- Adaptogen Science Tasty ISO Hydrolyzed 100% Whey Protein Isolate Chocolate Truffle – Lead, Cadmium
- Adaptogen Science Tasty ISO Hydrolyzed 100% Whey Protein Isolate Vanilla Sundae - Lead
- 6. Adaptogen Science Tasty Whey 100% Premium Whey Protein Cookie Butter Lead
- Adaptogen Science Tasty Whey 100% Premium Whey Protein Cookies & Cream - Lead
- 8. Adaptogen Science Tasty Whey Deluxe Instantized 100% Pure Whey Protein French Vanilla Swirl Lead
- Adaptogen Science Tasty Whey Deluxe Instantized 100% Pure Whey Protein Chocolate Meltdown - Lead

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

Cadmium was officially listed as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity and male reproductive toxicity on May 1, 1997, while cadmium and cadmium compounds were listed as chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer on October 1, 1987.

This letter is a notice to the Violator and the appropriate governmental authorities of the Proposition 65 violations concerning the listed products. This notice covers all violations of Proposition 65 involving the Violator currently known to ERC from the information now available. ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations. A summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with the copy of this letter to the Violator.

The Violator has manufactured, marketed, distributed, and/or sold the listed products, which has exposed and continues to expose numerous individuals within California to the identified chemicals, lead and cadmium. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products by consumers. The route of exposure to lead and cadmium has been through ingestion. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to lead and cadmium. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product's label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because it failed to provide an appropriate warning to persons ingesting these products that they are being exposed to lead and cadmium. Each of these ongoing violations has occurred on every day since June 15, 2015, as well as every day since the products were introduced in the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users.

Pursuant to Section 25249.7(d) of the statute, ERC intends to file a citizen enforcement action sixty days after effective service of this notice unless the Violator agrees in an enforceable written instrument to: (1) reformulate the listed products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemicals; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and my client's objectives in pursuing this notice, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution to this matter. Such resolution will avoid both further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemicals and expensive and time-consuming litigation.

ERC's Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall, and is located at 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. 619-500-3090. ERC has retained me in connection with this matter. We suggest that communications regarding this Notice of Violations should be directed to my attention at the above listed law office address and telephone number.

Sincerely,

Rick Franco

Attachments

Certificate of Merit Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Adaptogen Science, LLC, and its Registered Agent for Service of Process only)

Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Adaptogen Science, LLC

I, Rick Franco, declare:

- This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day notice in which it is alleged the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
- 2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.
- I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemicals that are the subject of the notice.
- 4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
- 5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: June 15, 2018

Rick Franco

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On June 15, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY" on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it in a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified and First Class Mail and by arranging for Personal Service on the Registered Agent:

Current President or CEO Adaptogen Science, LLC 3250 NE 1st Avenue, Suite 24 Miami, FL 33137

Current President or CEO Adaptogen Science, LLC 1342 NW 78th Avenue Miami, FL 33126 Fernando Rosenberg (Registered Agent for Adaptogen Science, LLC) 3250 NE 1st Avenue, Suite 24 Miami, FL 33137

On June 15, 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1) were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice:

Office of the California Attorney General Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On June 15, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553 sgrassini@contracostada.org Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator Lassen County 220 S. Lassen Street Susanville, CA 96130 mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney Monterey County 1200 Aguajito Road Monterey, CA 93940 Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Allison Haley, District Attorney Napa County 1127 First Street, Suite C Napa, CA 94559 CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney Riverside County 3072 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501 Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney Sacramento County 901 G Street Sacramento, CA 95814 Prop65@sacda.org

Kathryn L. Turner, Chief Deputy City Attorney San Diego City Attorney 1200 Third Avenue San Diego, CA 92101 CityAttyCrimProp65@sandiego.gov

Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney San Francisco County 732 Brannan Street San Francisco, CA 94103 gregory.alker@sfgov.org

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney San Joaquin County 222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202 Stockton, CA 95202 DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney San Luis Obispo County County Government Center Annex, 4th Floor San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney Santa Barbara County 1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101 DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney Santa Clara County 70 W Hedding St San Jose, CA 95110 EPU@da.sccgov.org

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street Santa Cruz, CA 95060 Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney Sonoma County 600 Administration Dr Sonoma, CA 95403 jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney Tulare County 221 S Mooney Blvd Visalia, CA 95370 Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney Ventura County 800 S Victoria Ave Ventura, CA 93009 daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney Yolo County 301 Second Street Woodland, CA 95695 cfepd@yolocounty.org

On June 15, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it with the U.S. Postal Service with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on June 15, 2018, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Phyllis Dunwoody

Page 9

District Attorney, Alameda County 1225 Fallon Street, Suite 900 Oakland, CA 94612

District Attorney, Alpine County P.O. Box 248 Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador County 708 Court Street, Suite 202 Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte County 25 County Center Drive, Suite 245 Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Calaveras County 891 Mountain Ranch Road San Andreas, CA 95249

District Attorney, Colusa County 346 Fifth Street Suite 101 Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte County 450 H Street, Room 171 Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, El Dorado County 515 Main Street Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Fresno County 2220 Tulare Street, Suite 1000 Fresno, CA 93721

District Attorney, Glenn County Post Office Box 430 Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt County 825 5th Street 4th Floor Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial County 940 West Main Street, Ste 102 El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Inyo County P.O. Drawer D Independence, CA 93526

District Attorney, Kern County 1215 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings County 1400 West Lacey Boulevard Hanford, CA 93230

Service List

District Attorney, Lake County 255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles County Hall of Justice 211 West Temple St., Ste 1200 Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera County 209 West Yosemite Avenue Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin County 3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130 San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mariposa County Post Office Box 730 Mariposa, CA 95338

District Attorney, Mendocino County Post Office Box 1000 Ukish, CA 95482

District Attorney, Merced County 550 W. Main Street Merced, CA 95340

District Attorney, Modoc County 204 S Court Street, Room 202

Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono County Post Office Box 617 Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, Nevada County 201 Commercial Street Nevada City, CA 95959

District Attorney, Orange County 401 West Civic Center Drive Santa Ana, CA 92701

District Attorney, Placer County 10810 Justice Center Drive, Ste 240 Roseville, CA 95678

District Attorney, Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 404 Quincy, CA 95971

District Attorney, San Benito County 419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Hollister, CA 95023 District Attorney,San Bernardino County 303 West Third Street San Bernadino, CA 92415

District Attorney, San Diego County 330 West Broadway, Suite 1300 San Diego, CA 92101

District Attorney, San Mateo County 400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Shasta County 1355 West Street Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra County 100 Courthouse Square, 2^{nJ} Floor Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou County Post Office Box 986 Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano County 675 Texas Street, Ste 4500 Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus County 832 12th Street, Ste 300 Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter County 463 2nd Street Yuba City, CA 95991

District Attorney, Tehama County Post Office Box 519 Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity County Post Office Box 310 Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne County 423 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba County 215 Fifth Street, Suite 152 Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's Office City Hall East 200 N. Main Street, Suite 800 Los Angeles, CA 90012

San Francisco, City Attorney City Hall, Room 234 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett PL San Francisco, CA 94102 San Jose City Attorney's Office 200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor San Jose, CA 95113

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as "Proposition 65"). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at: http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html.

The "Proposition 65 List." Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65 list/Newlist.html.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65.

Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before "knowingly and intentionally" exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be "clear and reasonable." This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

Grace Period. Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses "no significant risk." This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific "No Significant Risk Levels" (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at:

http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 et seq. of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the "no observable effect level" divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 et seq. of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a "significant amount" of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a "significant amount" of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A "significant amount" means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the "no significant risk" level for

² See Section 25501(a)(4).

chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the "no observable effect" level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at: http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.